Minutes for the Joint AQMP Advisory Group & STMPR Advisory Group Meeting
Thursday, February 20, 2003
1:00 pm – 4:00 pm

1. Welcome and Introductions

Dr. Elaine Chang, Deputy Executive Officer, Planning, Rules and Area Sources, called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

2. Review of January 22, 2003 Meeting Minutes

Dr. Laki Tisopulos, Assistant Deputy Executive Officer, opened the floor to comments on the Meeting Minutes from the January 22, 2003 meeting which had been previously distributed to Advisory Group members.

Questions and Responses

- *One member acknowledged that the minutes included his comment that the term carrying capacity is not necessarily clear to the general public. He again expressed an interest in devising another term for carrying capacity.*
  Dr. Tisopulos stated that "carrying capacity" is a standard term historically used in the AQMP, but agreed to include an explanation in the AQMP relative to the term.

- *Will the $13,500 dollar threshold for proposed VOC rules (that requires additional socioeconomic analysis for such a proposal) be carried forward in the 2003 AQMP?*
  Dr. Tisopulos confirmed that it would be.

3. Status of AQMP Revision

Dr. Laki Tisopulos opened the discussion on the status of the AQMP revision. The discussion was divided into four sections: inventory; modeling; control strategy; and comments received to date.

3a. Inventory

Mr. Zorik Pirveysian, Planning and Rules Manager, mentioned that some minor baseline adjustments have been made in the inventory, and the adjustments will be reflected in the final plan. These adjustments are ones that had been established after the inventory had been "frozen." They will be identified with the abbreviation "BA" for baseline adjustment in Appendix V.

Dr. Chang mentioned that we are seeking technical input on the emission projection methodology for stationary sources. Traditionally we have used an output-based methodology which is generally reflected as productivity multiplied by employment data. In the last Plan revision, some stakeholders had pointed out that for certain categories emission growth should be based not on output but on employment. Dr. Chang requested

economists and other stakeholders to help the AQMD refine the emission forecasting methodology so that the accuracy of emission projections can be improved.

3b. Modeling/Attainment Demonstration

Mr. Joe Cassmassi, Senior Meteorologist, gave a summary of the modeling efforts to date. He stated that the District had conducted internal tests and a "blue ribbon" panel to review the modeling done by AQMD staff. The panel includes Dr. Shep Burton, private consultant (formerly with SAI); Dr. Judy Chow, Desert Research Institute; Dr. Rob Harley, UC Berkeley; Fred Lurmann, Sonoma Technology; Dr. Ned Myers, formerly with U.S. EPA; Dr. John Seinfeld, Caltech; and Mel Zeldin, formerly with AQMD. The general comments from the panel included: 1) we should understand the practicality of what we are trying to do with the tool we are using (i.e., cannot use numerous models, but rather need to choose one and live within its limitations); 2) it is best to start moving toward using the tools that represent the current state of the science; and 3) suggestions for improved model performance and stress tests of models.

The conclusion based on the modeling efforts to date is to use UAM with the CBIV chemistry mechanism as the chosen platform for the draft Plan, but to also consider using CALGRID with SAPRC99 chemistry provided the performance can be improved and we feel comfortable with the results. Additionally, the modeling analysis has been extended from using the August 1997 episode to including August 1987 episode. Both episodes show an attainment demonstration which brings us below 12.5 pphm in 2010. The carrying capacity based on the modeling to date is approximately 310 tons per day of VOC.

Dr. Tisopulos added that while we feel that CALGRID is not yet ready to be used for this attainment demonstration, the CEQA analysis (i.e., the Environmental Impact Report for the Draft 2003 AQMP) will include project alternatives with a carrying capacity that reflects the results from the CALGRID model runs (which is approximately 250 t/d of VOC) to provide flexibility if we later choose to use CALGRID.

Mr. Cassmassi also provided a short summary of the technical subtleties of the PM10 modeling, indicating that the modeling done to date shows that we should be in compliance by 2006. He also discussed the CO attainment demonstration, stating that we have technically attained the CO standard in the Basin since we have had no violations in 2001 and only one in 2002. Computer modeling has also been performed which shows future peak concentrations should be below federal standards from now on into the future.

Questions and Responses

- *Do the modeling results mean that we have a lower carrying capacity or that greater reductions are needed to demonstrate attainment?*

Mr. Cassmassi explained that both are correct; that is, greater reductions are needed for two reasons - the carrying capacity is lower and the starting point (i.e., emissions inventory) is greater.

- *Is staff's decision making on which model to be used done on strictly a mathematical basis, or is staff taking into account the ramifications on the sources that would be impacted by the model choice?*
  Dr. Barry Wallerstein, Executive Officer, stated that the one mandate he has given to staff is to do the best science and then let the policymakers deal with the results. The thought process that has lead to our decisions will be documented (in Appendix V) and discussed in public forums so as to be transparent to the policy makers and stakeholders.

- *Clarify whether the NOx reductions used for the ozone attainment demonstration are sufficient for the PM10 attainment demonstration.*
  Mr. Cassmassi responded that while the NOx reductions do help us achieve the PM10 standard in 2006, they are essential for the future PM2.5 attainment demonstration. Mr. Cassmassi added that based on the current control strategy, we do not expect to meet the California PM10 standards in the near future.

- *Knowing that Rubidoux has a localized problem relative to PM10, are regional control measures sufficient to demonstrate attainment?*
  Mr. Cassmassi responded that while we recognize that Rubidoux is unique, the air quality monitor in Rubidoux was previously in a dirt field with farming activities nearby which made it subjected to a greater volume of fugitive dust than other stations; consequently, the monitor has been moved to an area within the same general vicinity but with a different ground cover setting. Dr. Chang added that though there are no geographic controls proposed in the Plan, there is a proposed control measure for aggregate operations which will help reduce PM10 concentrations in the Rubidoux area since there is a stationary source located there. Also, the other PM10 measures in the Plan are expected to help all areas of the Basin including Rubidoux.

3c. Control Strategy

New Control Measures

Mr. Zorik Pirveysian summarized six new control measures being introduced as part of the draft 2003 AQMP which were not included in the Preview document. The measures are:

1. Truck Stop Electrification
2. Emission Reductions from Wood Burning Fireplaces and Wood Stoves
3. Natural Gas Fuel Specifications
4. Further Emission Reductions from Large VOC Sources

5. Further Emission Reductions from In-Use Off-Road Mobile Vehicles and Equipment
6. Emission Fee Program for Port-Related Mobile Sources

As part of Mr. Pirveysian's presentation, AQMD and CARB staff clarified the general concepts of these new measures in response to questions relative to the details of the measures. It was noted that these are in the conceptual stage and staff has not precluded any innovative or otherwise non-traditional control approaches. Being conceptual in nature, most of these measures do not yet have emission reduction commitments associated with them.

Methodology to Distribute Emission Reduction Responsibility

Dr. Chang summarized the total tons of reductions needed to reach the carrying capacity. Two scenarios were presented, the first being the preferred approach of the AQMD, the second being the preferred approach of CARB:

1. Scenario I: Agencies achieve 1997/1999 SIP emission targets (remaining emissions) with necessary additional reductions assigned by relative inventory contribution by agency.
2. Scenario II: Reductions beyond current agency commitment to be identified in the future with CARB taking responsibility to ensure their adoption and implementation by appropriate agencies as early as practicable, but no later than 2009.

Ms. Cynthia Marvin, Chief, Air Quality and Transportation Planning Branch, CARB, clarified CARB's position relative to Scenarios I and II. Ms. Marvin stated that CARB preferred to let the division of responsibility by agency flow from the feasible strategies rather than try to devise it in advance. CARB and AQMD are not going in radically different directions. The preferred approaches are a subtlety relative to how we portray the legal commitments and how we package it for U.S. EPA in terms of the expectations or where emission reductions are going to come from in order to meet the long-term commitments.

Dr. Chang explained that the Plan will also include two options relative to the Federal commitment since U.S. EPA staff has expressed that they will disapprove the Plan if the AQMP prescribes a specific reduction assignment to Federal sources.

1. Option 1: SIP submittal with U.S. EPA obligations of 18 tpd VOC and 68 tpd of NOx.
2. Option 2: SIP submittal without U.S. EPA obligations (higher carrying capacity by 68 tpd of NOx).

Questions and Responses

- *Is a range of carrying capacities more appropriate to the Plan since there appears to be some uncertainty as to the exact number?*
  We have done sensitivity analyses for gross projections to provide a range, but when you talk about carrying capacity it is always a set number. While it is acknowledged that air quality computer models are not 100 percent certain, most of the models are conforming into a single carrying capacity number as we have come to a more structured pathway to attain the standards. The number may not be exactly 310, but any deviation is insignificant and has no effect on the size of the black box.

- *Have you run the model based on the revised emissions inventory and, if you have, has it predicted the ambient air quality concentration?*
  Yes. We have run UAM simulation for 2002 using the day we had for our primary episode. We modeled one of the basin high days for this year - a day that was extremely similar (but not identical) to the primary episode - and had a good results from the model.

- *What is the timing for the adoption of the Plan? Why are we moving so fast, and what are the barriers from slowing the process down? Innovative measures and concepts should be discussed at greater length before you adopt the Plan. Considering the unprecedented control requirements that we are faced with, the question is what is the best way to achieve the results we are seeking?*
  Dr. Wallerstein, responding at length to these comments, stated that we need to assure ourselves that transportation conformity is addressed so as to not jeopardize billions of dollars of Federal transportation funds. An additional element of urgency is that every month that goes by without implementing the defined controls becomes a greater obstacle to achieving ozone attainment in 2010 and PM2.5 attainment in 2014. If we hadn't taken as much time in the last few years, we might not be in the situation we are now. AQMD and CARB are also under obligation (e.g., settlement agreements, court orders, etc.) for certain commitments.

  In terms of specific control measures that are currently in the conceptual phase, there is ample time between now and the time of adoption to work out the issues or to at least put such measures in some sidebar class such that we wouldn't be concerned about legal obligations to adopt them.

  It must also be recognized that there are stakeholders representing a segment of society who are surprised and alarmed by the emission inventory increase and the reduced carrying capacity and see us moving backward. These stakeholders are potential litigants of our Plan, and we do not want to become embroiled in another set of litigations which are ultimately non-productive as well as very expensive.

  It is hard to engage the public debate without the draft Plan. As soon as we produce the document, there will be all kinds of media coverage of the Plan and the hard choices that need to be made. Coupled with our outreach efforts, we feel confident

that a robust public debate will be part of the Plan development. Thus, we are planning to go to the Board for a pre-hearing so they can hear from the public and provide staff with direction for the final Plan. If at the end of the day the Plan is not ready to bring to the Board we will adjust the schedule; to adjust the schedule and delay the difficult policy decisions up front is not a recommended approach. We are in this situation partially because policy decisions have not yet been made. From past experience, we know it will take many additional months in terms of substantive and procedural efforts if we go to the Board and they ask us to go back and re-analyze a number of issues and make revisions. Thus, we need to have the Board engaged early.

Finally, we would like to move quickly as a way to reach out to the Federal government and solidify the need for control of sources under their jurisdiction and get them moving forward on creative control solutions.

- *One member reminded the group that AQMP effort is related to human health which is time urgent. While consideration, compromise, and discussion are required, we need to put something into effect as rapidly as possible.*

3d. Summary of AQMD Board Retreat

Dr. Chang summarized the discussions from the recent AQMD Board retreat. The AQMD Board is fully aware of the emission reduction shortfall, the predominant sources of emissions, and past control efforts and agency share. The direction staff was given was that regardless of past accomplishments, they want to know what it will take to demonstrate attainment. The Board asked us to specifically look into emissions from the port, the Alameda corridor, and other such sources. The Board also asked legal staff to look into whether there is some limited and specific legal authority we do not have but would help us expedite emission reductions. The Board's direction is reflected in some of the new control measures we have presented today.

3e. Summary of Comments Received on Preliminary Draft 2003 AQMP Appendices Previously Released

Mr. Pirveysian provided a brief summary of comments received to date on the four preliminary draft appendices previously released. Mr. Pirveysian informed the group that the comments will be considered for incorporation into the draft Plan.

4. AQMP Public Review Process

Dr. Tisopulos informed the participants of the schedule for the Public Workshops for the draft 2003 AQMP as well as the general schedule for bringing the 2003 AQMP to the AQMD Governing Board.

5. Administrative Issues

Dr. Tisopulos reminded the group that under newly adopted Governing Board procedures, staff was required to prepare Goals and Objectives for the STMPR Advisory Group. The Goals and Objectives were provided prior to the meeting as well as at the meeting, and Dr. Tisopulos asked the members to provide comments on them by the next meeting.

Dr. Tisopulos also informed the Advisory Group that we will be forwarding via email the roster for the group and would like members to revise the information as appropriate (e.g., no longer interested in participating, new alternates, etc.). The revised rosters will be reviewed for approval by the AQMD Governing Board.

Dr. Tisopulos covered the schedule for the next few Advisory Group meetings.

6. Public Comment Period

Harvey Eder, President, Public Solar Power Coalition, suggested that the AQMD investigate the use of solar and other alternative power generation technologies as part of the control strategy.

7. Adjourn

Dr. Chang adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

Attendees of the Joint Air Quality Management Plan Advisory Group &
STMPR Advisory Group Meeting
Thursday, February 20, 2003
1:00 pm– 4:00 pm

AQMP ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERS PRESENT

Greg Adams, Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Don Blose, American Lung Association
Shep Burton, Consultant
Curtis Coleman, California Manufacturers Association /So. Cal. Air Quality Alliance
Gretchen Hardison, City of Los Angeles
Molly Hoffman, Southern California Association of Governments
Ok Hwan Kim, Orange County Dry Cleaners Association/Prompt Cleaners
Bill Quinn, California Council for Environmental and Economic Balance
Ty Schuiling, San Bernardino Associated Governments
John Seinfeld, California Institute of Technology
Jeb Stuart, Construction Industry Air Quality Coalition
Carla Walecka, Realtors Committee on Air Quality
Robert Wyman, Latham & Watkins

AQMP ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERS NOT PRESENT

Detrich Allen, City of Los Angeles
Gerry Bonetto, Printing Industries of Califoria
Tim Carmichael, Coalition for Clean Air
Jot Condie, California Restaurant Association
Bob Dulla, Sierra Research
Bahram Fazeli, Communities for a Better Environment
Bob Feenstra, Milk Producers Council
Virginia Field, Clean Air Now, Riverside
Joe Garcia, Councilmember, City of Monrovia
Dr. Henry Gong Jr., Environmental Health Service, Rancho Los Amigos Medical Center
David Hayes-Bautista, Center for the Study of Latino Health
Dave Jesson, U.S. Environmental Agency
Bob Kanter, Port of Long Beach
Diana Kotler, City of Anaheim
Coachella Valley Association of Governments
Steve Levy, Center for the Continuing Study of the California Economy
Bradford McAllester, L.A. County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Peter Okurowski, California Environmental Associates
Mark Pisano, Southern California Association of Governments
Dominic Polimeni, Mayor, City of San Gabriel
Julie Puentes, Orange County Business Council

Lynn Terry, California Air Resources Board
Michael Wang, Western States Petroleum Association

STMPR ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERS PRESENT
Carol Bohnenkamp, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Shep Burton, Consultant
Rob Farber, Southern California Edison
Ralph Morris, Environ

STMPR ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:
Bill Dennison, Small Business Alliance/Dennison & Associates
Alan Dunker, General Motors
Fereidun Feizollahi, California Air Resource Board
Jane Hall, California State University, Fullerton Department of Economics
Daniel Hays, University of Southern California School of Medicine
Steve Levy, Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy
Fred Lurmann, Sonoma Technology, Inc.
John DaMassa, California Air Resources Board
Paul Ong, UCLA School of Public Policy & Social Research
Karen Polenske, MIT Department of Urban Studies & Planning
Erin Sheehy, Environmental Compliance Solutions
George Treyz, Regional Economic Models, Inc.
Thomas Tyson, G.E. Energy & Environmental Research
Michael Wang, Western States Petroleum Association
Bruce DeVine, Southern California Association of Governments

OTHERS PRESENT:
John Billheimer, Enviro-Reality
Michael Beasley, Boeing Satellite Systems
Rene Brandt, City of Los Angeles
Harvey Eder, Public Solar Power Coalition
Steve Fox, L.A. County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Richard Friedman, EES
Eric Lama, Coatings Resource & OCBC
Clayton Miller, Construction Industry Air Quality Coalition
Martin Ledwitz, Southern California Edison
Ralph Morris, Environ
Gina Mooty, Public Pomona College
Jon Owyang, Market-Based Solutions
Paul Pau, Los Angeles Department of Water & Power
Matt Rezvani, BP
Michelle Richards, Universal Studio
Michael Schulz, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Arnie Sherwood, ITS, UCB

Steve Simons, Southern California Gas Company
Sylvia Stanley, Orange County Transportation Authority
Ashwani Vasishth, Southern California Association of Governments

AQMD STAFF:
Sam Atwood, Senior Public Information Specialist
Barbara Baird, District Counsel
Elaine Chang, Deputy Executive Officer
Joe Cassmassi, Senior Meteorologist
Ed Eckerle, Program Supervisor
Frances Keeler, Senior Deputy District Counsel
Michael Krause, Air Quality Specialist
Julia Lester, Program Supervisor
Jonathan Nadler, Air Quality Specialist
Zorik Pirveysian, Planning & Rules Manager
Steve Smith, Program Supervisor
Laki Tisopulos, Assistant Deputy Executive Officer
Greg Ushijima, Assistant Air Quality Engineer